REMARKS

Claims 1, 5 and 7 have been amended. Support for the amendment to claims 1, 5 and 7 can be found at page 14, lines 14-21 of the specification.

New claim 22 has been added and is somewhat similar to claim 1.

Claims 1, 3-7 and 10-22 are now pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I.   REJECTION OF CLAIM 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101:

As mentioned above, claim 7 has been amended. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

II.   REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3-7, 10 AND 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chigira et al. (US Patent No. 4,949,253; hereinafter "Chigira") in view of Stack (US Patent No. 6,257,774):

The present invention, as recited in claim 1, for example, relates to an automatic program generation apparatus for automatically generating a program that will perform a predetermined processing. The apparatus comprises a plurality of data structure resolution units that respectively include a model program for corresponding data structure, wherein the model program includes resolution logic for performing a setting peculiar to said predetermined processing. The apparatus as recited in claim 1, further comprises a resolution unit for generating a program for performing said predetermined processing by acquiring resolution information relating to said setting peculiar to said predetermined processing for resolution logic included in said model program in said data structure resolution unit corresponding to a selected data structure and by synthesizing the model program and the resolution information for the resolution logic. The resolution logic comprises an analyzer that analyzes said resolution logic included in said model program in said data structure resolution unit corresponding to the selected data structure to specify items of said resolution information to be inputted, and prompts a user to input said resolution information for said resolution logic based on the specified items in the analysis.

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Chigira discloses "an analyzer that analyzes said resolution logic included in said model program in said data structure resolution unit corresponding to the selected data structure". However, column 2, lines 44-48 of Chigira merely discloses "a processing unit for generating a program part by analyzing the input information to the input/output unit 21, selecting one of the program part prototypes from the

memory unit 23 in accordance with the analysis and modifying the selected program part prototype". The Applicants respectfully submit that the input information as analyzed in Chigira is not comparable to "said resolution logic included in said model program" as in the claimed invention.

At page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Chigira does not prompt a user to input said resolution information for said resolution logic based on the analysis and synthesizing the model program and the acquired resolution information for the resolution logic. However, the Examiner asserts that Stack discloses this feature at column 5, lines 24-28. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Applicants respectfully submit that neither Chigira nor Stack, individually or combined teach or suggest "said resolution unit" as described in claim 1. Thus, although Stack begins the process by "prompting a user to input choices to define a file structure, program structure, or create a field definition", the combination of Chigira and Stack fails to disclose "said resolution information for said resolution logic is not prompted to be input based on the specified items in the analysis", as in the claimed invention.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Thus, the combination of Chigira and Stack fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-7, 10 and 13 patentably distinguish over Chigira in view of Stack. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III.   REJECTION OF CLAIMS 11 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER CHIGIRA IN VIEW OF WASHIZAKI ET AL. (US PATENT NO. 5,212,634; HEREINAFTER "WASHIZAKI"):

Chigira fails to disclose all of the features as recited in claim 5 from which claims 11 and 14, indirectly depend for the reasons mentioned above.

At page 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Chigira fails to disclose "the data structure type is a slip type". However, the Examiner asserts that Washizaki discloses this feature.

Although Washizaki discloses a method and apparatus for automatically generating application programs such as "a slip processing program" (see column 1, lines 42-43),

11

<u>Washizaki</u> does not make up for all of the deficiencies of <u>Chigira</u> as recited above.

Therefore, the combination of <u>Chigira</u> and <u>Washizaki</u> fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 11 and 14 patentably distinguish over <u>Chigira</u> in view of <u>Washizaki</u>. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV.   REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12, 16 AND 17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER <u>CHIGIRA</u> IN VIEW OF WEBBER ET AL. (US PATENT NO. 5,331,546; HEREINAFTER "<u>WEBBER</u>"):

At page 15 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that <u>Chigira</u> fails to disclose "the data structure is a type of time band, seat reservation, and plan" as recited in the claimed invention. However, the Examiner asserts that <u>Webber</u> discloses these features.

Although <u>Webber</u> discloses a travel planner system communicating with a processor, a storage device which includes a tariff file, a traveler file and a rules file, and a airline reservation system (see column 5, lines 34-38), <u>Webber</u> fails to disclose all of the deficiencies of <u>Chigira</u> as recited above.

Thus, the combination of <u>Chigira</u> and <u>Webber</u> fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 12, 16 and 17 patentably distinguish over <u>Chigira</u> in view of <u>Webber</u>. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

.V.   REJECTION OF CLAIMS 18, 20 AND 21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER <u>CHIGIRA</u> IN VIEW OF <u>SCHNEIER</u> (US PATENT NO. 5,850,516):

At page 16 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that <u>Chigira</u> fails to disclose "the data structures types of a composition, tree type, or hierarchy" as recited in the claimed invention. However, the Examiner asserts that <u>Schneier</u> discloses these features.

Although <u>Schneier</u> discloses a computer system that stores a database tree structure an accepts input from the user in the form of leaf node values(see column 4, lines 50-53; and column 6, lines 25-39), <u>Schneier</u> fails to disclose all of the deficiencies of <u>Chigira</u> as recited above.

Thus, the combination of <u>Chigira</u> and <u>Schneier</u> fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 18, 20 and 21 patentably distinguish over <u>Chigira</u> in view of <u>Schneier</u>. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VI. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 15 AND 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER <u>CHIGIRA</u> IN VIEW OF SUZUKI ET AL. (US PATENT NO. 6,470,323; HEREINAFTER "<u>SUZUKI</u>"):

At page 17 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that <u>Chigira</u> fails to disclose data type structure types of a stock and a pedigree, as recited in the claimed invention. However, the Examiner asserts that <u>Suzuki</u> discloses these features.

<u>Suzuki</u> discloses a goods sales management system which communicates directly to customers via a communication line, whereby the system includes a database that stores information such as goods transaction information needed for tracking customer history, tracking the inventory of goods (see Abstract and column 3, lines 1-8). However, <u>Suzuki</u> does not make up for the deficiencies of <u>Chigira</u> as recited above.

Thus, the combination of <u>Chigira</u> and <u>Suzuki</u> fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 15 and 19 patentably distinguish over <u>Chigira</u> in view of <u>Suzuki</u>. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VII. CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: *[signature]* November 15, 2004

By: *[signature]*
Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501